1:Heckewelder M-5 (ca.1800) 1819
NM7 Delaware NM7
Iroquois NM9

seat, nor looked around, or even at one another; but they all remained sitting in the same posture as before, smoking their pipes as if nothing had happened.

D
I
626

Though there are sometimes individuals in a nation, who disregard the counsel and good advice given by the chiefs, yet they do not meet with support so as to be able to oppose the measures of government. They are generally looked upon as depraved beings, who not daring to associate with the others, lurk about by themselves, generally bent on mischief of a minor kind, such as pilfering small articles of goods and provisions. As soon, however, as they go a step further, and become known thieves and murderers, they are considered a disgrace to the nation, and being in a manner disowned by it, they are no longer entitled to their protection.

In the year 1785, an Indian of this description, murdered a Mr. Evans at Pittsburg; when, after a confinement of several months, his trial was to be brought on, the chiefs of his (the Delaware nation,) were invited to come to be present at the proceedings and see how the trial would be conducted, and also, if they chose, to speak in behalf of the accused. These chiefs, however, instead of coming, as wished for, sent to the civil officers of that place the following laconic answer: "Brethren! You "inform us that N. N. who murdered one of your men "at Pittsburg, is shortly to be tried by the laws of your "country, at which trial you request that some of us "may be present! Brethren! knowing N. N. to have "been always a very bad man, we do not wish to see "him! We, therefore, advise you to try him by your "laws, and to hang him, so that he may never return to "us again."

I shall conclude this subject with another anecdote. When in the winter of 1788 and 1789, the Indian nations were assembling at Fort Harmer, at the mouth of the Muskingum, where a treaty was to be held, an Indian of the Seneca nation was one morning found dead on the

l:Heckewelder M-5 (ca. 1800)1819
NM7 Delaware NM7

672 685 shore. The question being put and fully discussed, whether those men with the canoe, who had taken charge of the property of the others, and by this neglect lost the whole, were not liable to pay for the loss? it was decided in the negative, on the following grounds:

1. That the canoe men had taken the articles on board, with the pleasing hope that they thereby would oblige their fellow men, and did not expect any recompense for that service.

2. That although they might have avoided the danger and the loss, by unloading the canoe at the head of the fall, and carrying the cargo by land below it, (which was but a short distance,) as was customary, when the river was not in a proper state to run through, yet that, had those who travelled by land been in the place of those in the canoe, they might, like them, have attempted to have run through, as is sometimes done with success, and been equally unfortunate.

3. That the canoe men having had all their own property on board, which was all lost at the same time, and was equally valuable to them, it was clear that they had expected to run safely through, and could not have intentionally or designedly brought on themselves and others the misfortune which had happened, and therefore the circumstance must be ascribed entirely to *accident*.

672 Such is the disposition of the Indians with regard to those who inadvertently meet with a disaster, whereby others are injured. They are ready to overlook a fault, and more disposed in such cases to commiserate, than to punish; but with those who wilfully and intentionally commit aggressions and injure others, they think and act quite differently; a malicious person is generally despised, and if he intrudes himself into good company, they will, without saying a word, steal off one by one, and leave him alone to suffer the mortification which it is intended he should feel. For murderers and thieves they have no compassion, and punish them according to

[626]

3:Zeisberger M-5 (1767-1780)1910
NM7 Delaware NM7

428 longed to the man, and bring it to one place. The friends do not keep a single article, for they wish to forget the dead and are afraid lest the smallest part of the property of the deceased should remind them of him. They give what the deceased has left to their friends and no one of his friends receives anything; even though he should wish to take something he will not do it through fear of the others. If a dying Indian leaves his gun or any other trifle to a particular friend the legatee is immediately put in possession and no one disputes his right. The widow gets nothing, yet whatever the husband has given to his wife during his life-time remains her property. Therefore we need not wonder that a married Indian pair should not have their goods in common, for otherwise the wife would be left wholly destitute after her husband's death. In like manner the husband inherits nothing when his wife dies.

768 587 According to ancient custom a widow should not marry again within a year after the death of her husband, for the Indians say that he does not forsake her before that time. At the end of this period, however, they believe that his soul goes to its place. A widow must endeavor to live by her own industry. She is not permitted to purchase any meat, for the Indians are superstitiously persuaded that their guns fail if a widow should eat of the game they have killed. Now and then a kind friend will venture to transgress the rule and give her some meat secretly. As soon as the first year of her widowhood is passed, the friends of the deceased husband clothe and provide for her and her children. They also propose another husband if they know of a desirable party, or, at least, tell her that she is now at liberty to choose for herself. If, however, she has not attended to the prescribed rule but married within the year, they never trouble themselves about her again except, perhaps, to speak evil of her.

626

If a man's wife die, her relatives pretend to have some claim upon him until a year has passed. If he has remained a widower during that time they generally secure him a wife, preferring a sister of the departed, if one be living.

764 The burying places are at some distance from the towns. Before they had hatchets and other tools they used to line the

3:Zeisberger M-5 (1767-1780)1910
NM7 Delaware NM7
Nanticoke NM11

D 1765 morning to the grave and weeps over it. This is repeated daily for some time but gradually less and less till the mourning period is over. Sometimes they place victuals on the grave that the deceased may not suffer hunger. The food thus left is generally consumed by dogs.

N 1764 The Nantikoks [Nantikokes] of whom more in another place, have this singular custom that about three or four months after the funeral they open the grave, take out the bones, clean them of the flesh and dry them, wrap them up in new linen and inter them again. A feast is usually provided for the occasion, consisting of the best they can afford. Only the bones of the arms and legs of the corpse are thus treated. All the rest is buried or burned.

D 626 181 The Indians are a free people, knowing neither law nor restraint. They may not be prevailed on in any matter that does not please them, much less forced. If they cannot be persuaded with gentle words, further effort is in vain.

D 361 Each of them may settle where he pleases. Not satisfied with one place, an Indian may move to a town with which he is better pleased and no one offers any objection; or he may retire to a solitary place. Rarely will a family move far away from all society, though they frequently live apart from the towns to avoid being annoyed by drunkards; or they live thus alone in order to carry on the profitable traffic in rum more to their advantage. Many engage in rum traffic, especially women, D 439 who fetch it from the white people and sell at a considerable profit to the Indians, often taking from the latter everything they have, sometimes even their rifles on which they depend for subsistence. Chiefs and counsellors have often considered what might be done to stop this ruinous trade, and have often determined that no one should ever bring spirituous liquors into their towns again; for a time such a resolution would be kept, and then be broken, perhaps by the very ones who had counselled the prohibition. Since the Indians have taken so much to drinking rum, murders are more frequent. Murder committed in D 682 drunkenness is not severely punished. Hence, it is that one 672 harboring hatred for another will, on the occasion of a drinking

[P. 37, A]

562 fulness, in comparison with the men, may
157 have been owing to the fact that they were much more restricted in childhood than their[a] brothers. Nowhere in Delaware society was there the model of anyone
592 with coercive authority; neither mother nor
622 father ruled the roost at home in an
625 authoritarian sense, the sachems had no power to enforce their wishes, and there was no conception of a state with police
586 powers. Divorce was easy and frequent and could be initiated by either party simply leaving the other.[36] Supernatural
776 beings were not Jehovah-like Gods who regularly punished the wicked and rewarded the good; the Delaware reckoned rather with a supernatural guardian spirit who acted as a comrade and friend who would assist his mortal protege in critical passes. Shame and pride are more frequent themes than guilt and self-righteousness;
577 Speck (referring to twentieth-century Oklahoma Delawares) says, "Spiritual purity . . . is not conditioned by ethical conduct, but rather . . . through the observance of taboo regulations prescribed by ancient rulings."[37]

155 It would seem to be a fair inference that
597 the Delaware often did not develop a strong authoritarian, coercive conscience; moral values (which certainly were recognized) did not possess an awesome, mosaic character; "good" and "bad" had a light affective tone.

114 Zeisberger, who as a Moravian believed
626 in less discipline and autocracy than was fashionable in eighteenth century Europe, was still puzzled as to how a society without authority could hold together. "Judged by the mere appearance of the Indians," he wrote, "one is surprised how modest and careful they are in relation to each other and imagines that the whites, if they were as free a people and had neither government nor punishment to fear, would not
626 be as united and peaceable as the Indians appear to be."[38] This superficial smooth-

36. Heckewelder, 1819, p. 154; Zeisberger, 1778, pp. 20-21.
37. Speck, 1931, p. 51.
38. Zeisberger, 1778, p. 122.

626 ness was accomplished, not by a fear of authority, but by everyone's fear of wounding someone else's self-esteem and thereby laying himself open to aggression. In order not to antagonize another, the individual had to be very circumspect in his behavior and avoid showing his own aggressive motives. There were a variety of institutionalized techniques which functioned to forestall possible antagonism-arousing situations. "They are not quarrelsome, and are always on their guard, so as not to offend each other," said Heckewelder, and Zeisberger made similar observations.[39] [831] Swearing was unknown (although obscenity was not tabooed).[40] Persons suspected of ill-doing were not accused openly; public or private disapproval was communicated by subtle allusions or by the [609] recital of a "dream."[41] Strangers and visitors were always treated politely; and negative replies to embassies from other communities were couched in ambiguous terms so that the matter was shelved rather than 576 contended over.[42] An elaborate code of 521 etiquette governed the men's talk. "Their common conversation turns upon hunting or the news of the day. Matter that has no foundation in fact may be drawn into conversation, and even though all may be aware of this, the narration continues uninterrupted. They may laugh now and again but they will listen attentively. No one interrupts another. When one has finished another begins. They never put any one publicly to blush; they are polite to each other and enjoy being politely treated. They like to be regarded as worthy people even though they may be the opposite. They are pleased to know that 796 they are liked."[43] Religious observances 776 (such as the periodic obligation to give a dance for a sacred mask) were performed under an almost obsessive fear that negligence, by offending the supernatural owner, would call down an indefinite but

39. Heckewelder, 1819, pp. 145-146; Zeisberger 1778, p. 115-116.
40. Zeisberger, 1778, p. 85.
41. Zeisberger, 1778, p. 120.
42. Heckewelder, 1819, p. 150.
43. Heckewelder, 1819, pp. 103-104; Zeisberger 1778, 115-116.

[P.38,A]

776
[796] crippling revenge.[44] Even animals, (for
[325] example, the bear) had to be conceptualized as quasi-human beings engaged in war with the Indians to legitimize their killing.[45]

Anticipation of Aggression

626 In view of these elaborate cultural devices for avoiding situations where aggressions might come to the surface, either in one's own self or in others, we might expect to find considerable anxiety in everyone over the suspicion that through some slip he might have aroused the hostility of an unknown enemy, especially since in every person there seems to have been a large amount of diffused aggression which could easily be projected onto other [754] people. The fear of witchcraft, for instance, was universal and demoralizing.[46] Lindestrom described the Delawares as "mistrustful;"[47] and both Zeisberger and [154] Heckewelder remarked on the elaborate institutions which functioned to deflect possible aggression.[48] Parents explained their reluctance to discipline children by [861] saying that "the children might remember it against them and avenge themselves when they have attained to maturity."[49] (Zeisberger said that he knew of some cases where children *did* threaten to punish their parents for indignities suffered in childhood.)[50]

Techniques for Expressing Aggression

154 All these mechanisms indicate that the typical Delaware individual harbored within himself exceptionally uncomfortable aggressive impulses which he was afraid to focus on anyone for fear of counter-aggression. The eruption of these aggressions periodically shattered the equable facade of social behavior. "They are able to control their desires and passions," observed Zeisberger, "but once given free

44. Speck, 1931, pp. 39-44.
45. Wallace, 1949.
46. Heckewelder, 1819, pp. 239-240.
47. Lindestrom, 1656, pp. 191-192.
48. Heckewelder, 1819, pp. 103-104; Zeisberger 1778, pp. 115-116.
49. Zeisberger, 1778, p. 81.
50. Ibid.